

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 7-23 are pending, Claims 7-12 having been amended, and Claims 13-17 having been withdrawn from consideration by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 7-9 and 11 were rejected as being anticipated by Inoue (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,017); Claims 10 and 12 were rejected as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Ronstrom (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,402); and Claims 18-23 were indicated as being allowed.

Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter.

Amended Claim 9 is directed to an information storage method for a mobile communications network in which a mobile terminal receives information through a plurality of channels. In response to a delivery channel (through which the information is delivered to the mobile terminal) being switched to another as the mobile terminal moves from a communication area to another, a communication node in the delivery channel through which the information has been delivered to the mobile terminal registers a portion of the information which has been stored therein. Support for the amendments is in the specification for example at Figure 3, and the discussion beginning at page 17, line 11, continuing to page 19. Moreover, amended Claim 7 requires that a responsive action to a switching of delivery channel causes a communication mode in a delivery channel through which the information has been delivered to the mobile terminal registers a portion of the information that has been stored therein.

Inoue is directed to a scheme for information delivery to mobile computers using cache servers. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Inoue nor Ronstrom teach or suggest the communication node registering a portion of the information stored therein in

response to the switching of a delivery channel. As these features are absent from the asserted prior art, it is respectfully submitted that whether taken individually or in combination, the asserted prior art neither anticipates nor renders obvious the invention defined by Claims 7-12, as amended.


Consequently, in view of the indication of allowable subject matter and in light of the amendments made to the rejected claims, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 7-12 and 18-23 patentably define over the asserted prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
BDL:sjh:maj
I:\ATTY\BDL\21s\218100US\218100US.AM2.DOC



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073